

16636

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are cancelled and Claims 11-20 are added. Claims 11-20 remain in the application. No new matter is added by the amendments to the claims.

In the Office Action dated October 4, 2004, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,259,805 issued to Freedman, et al. The Examiner stated:

As per Claim 1: Freedman, et al. discloses a method of initiating a security procedure within a building having a security system for controlling the security procedure comprising the steps of: COL.2, lines 1-51

a. generating a virtual key in response to an occurrence of a certain event related to a security procedure in a building; [COL. 7, lines 22-25 and COL.10 line 64 thin COL. 1, line 14]

b. transmitting the virtual key to a selected person; and [COL. 8, lines 49-51 and COL. 11, lines 65-67]

c. initiating the security procedure within the building when the selected person identifies himself with the virtual key to a security system of the building. [COL. 6, lines 5-14]

As per Claim 2: Freedman et al. discusses the method according to Claim 1 wherein a certain code is assigned to the virtual key by a selected encryption method. [COL. 9, lines 22-23 and COL. 14, lines 4-17]

As per Claim 3: Freedman et al. discusses the method according to Claim 1 including adding a signature to the virtual key with which the selected person can identify himself to third parties as an authorized person. [COL. 8, lines 27-28]

As per Claim 4: Freedman et al. discusses the method according to Claim 1 wherein a type of the security procedure depends upon a type of certain event. [COL. 10, lines 19-61]

As per Claim 5: Freedman et al. discusses the method according to Claim 1 wherein the security procedure controls an elevator in the building. [COL.10, lines 19-61]; the key describes the type of authorization and/or access of a user. Depending on the key, can give many or little access such as to a certain floor or room of the building or able to access the elevator of the particular building.

As per Claim 6: Freedman et al. discusses the method according to one of Claim 1 wherein the selected person to whom the virtual key is transmitted depends upon a type of the

0/file/594678-1

16636

certain event. COL. 10, lines 19-61; the key describes the type of authorization and/or access of a user. Depending on the key, can give many or little access such as to a certain floor or room of the building or able to access the elevator of the particular building.

As per Claim 7: Freedman et al. discusses the method according to Claim 1 including checking whether a previously generated virtual key exists for the selected person and, if so, whether the previously generated virtual key is being used with modification. [COL. 8, lines 4-22]

As per Claim 8: Freedman et al. discusses the method according to Claim 1 including checking whether a previously generated virtual key exists and fulfils security requirements of the security system and, if necessary, generating a new or augmented virtual key. [COL. 8, lines 4-22]

As per Claim 9: Freedman et al. discusses the method according to Claim 1 including checking what means is available to the selected person to identify himself and selecting a suitable one of the available means. [COL. 11, lines 50-60]

As per Claim 10: Freedman et al. discusses the method according to claim 1 wherein the selected person identifies himself when receiving the virtual key. [COL. 10, line 64 thru COL. 11, line 14]

New Claims 11-20 define a method of initiating a procedure within a building based upon detecting a predefined initiating event, generating a virtual key based upon a predetermined requirement for the procedure and a predefined person authorized to perform the procedure, transmitting the virtual key to the person, detecting the entered virtual key, checking the validity of the entered virtual key, and initiating the procedure if the validity check is positive. The Freedman et al. patent does not show or suggest the defining steps of Claim 11.

The Examiner made of record but did not discuss references to Boyle et al., Nendell et al., and Greenstein et al. Applicant reviewed these references and found them to be no more pertinent than the prior art relied upon by the Examiner in his rejections.

In view of the amendments to the claims and the above arguments, Applicant believes that the claims of record now define patentable subject matter over the art of record. Accordingly, an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.